

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,051	04/03/2001		Kristopher P. Braud	017017620004	2009
27964	7590	05/24/2004		EXAMINER	
HITT GA			TO, BAOQUOC N		
P.O. BOX 832570 RICHARDSON, TX 75083				ART UNIT PAPER N	PAPER NUMBER
	,			2172	1.
				DATE MAILED: 05/24/2004	ν

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/825,051	BRAUD ET AL.	\mathcal{O}
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	·
	Baoquoc N To	2172	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 10 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply cellater than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper the final	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action: or
A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF).	Brief must be filed within the pe		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) They raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceli NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	s.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: Ple	reconsideration has been consideration has been consideration has been considerated by the consideration by the consideration has been considerated by the consideration by the considera	dered but does NO	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-50</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The drawing correction filed on is a) \square appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	·// 1
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer 10. Other:	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	ALFORD KIN	

Application/Control Number: 09/825,051

Art Unit: 2172

The applicant argues "Swanson does not teach or suggest managing data from a plurality of ancillary system including determining whether data stored in an ancillary system is conductive to being processed into a value of a data item and retrieving data from one of the ancillary system and a data processing system based on the determining."

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the above argument. As previous discussed by the final office action dated on 03/09/04, Swanson suggests that "a client send in the request for service wherein the server determine which of servers to handle the request by the client stub 60 (col. 6, lines 37-50), wherein the requested information lies within another computer system 12 or subsystem 26-50 (col. 5, lines 8-1) wherein the subsystem is the ancillary system as claimed. The client request is being serviced by the server stub 62 in response to the determination of the client stub 60, wherein the server stub 62 unpack the input argument and calls the function desired by the client application. For example, in FIG 3, server program function 66 checks on the membership status. Server function 66 returns output arguments (and any error parameters) to the server stub 62, which passes them back to the client stub 60 (col. 6. lines 56-61) wherein data is being process comprising healthcare providers and a company, including physicians, hospitals, and dentist, reimbursement agreements between the providers and a company; effective dates; contracting entity; contracting companies; fee schedule and rates; rate type, such as, per dime, per hour, per stay, percentage; fee maximum; procedure codes; hospital, categories; government health care program information, such as, Medicaid and Medicare; and data relating to costs

Application/Control Number: 09/825,051

Art Unit: 2172

system."

associated with a medical service but for which a claim has not yet been received (col. 7, lines 45-54) wherein these data are conducive to processed into the values. Furthermore, in column 7, lines 3-14, Swanson suggests "client stubs 60 are responsible for locating a server to handle the request, packaging argument and passing them over the network 10 to the server with the validation ticket, waiting for the server to reply and unpacking the return value and output arguments returned by the server wherein the unpacking the return values are the values processed from the sub-

Claims 2-20, 22-40 and 42-50 are rejected under the same reason with independent claims 1, 21 and 41.